89-775

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 13 1989
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. 89-

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1989

GASTON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Petitioners,

vs.

KAREN LEIGH SHOOK, by and through her guardian ad litem, WENDY SHOOK,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

JAMES B. GARLAND*
219 West Main Avenue
Gastonia, North Carolina 28054
(704) 867-1113

Counsel for Petitioner Gaston County Board of Education

LACY H. THORNBURG
Attorney General

Edwin M. Speas, Jr.
Special Deputy Attorney General

3 1 P

Laura E. Crumpler
Assistant Attorney General

Bonnie E. Wilkison
Associate Attorney General

N.C. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
(919) 733-7387

Counsel for Petitioner The State
Of North Carolina and The North
Carolina State Board of Education

---

*Counsel of Record

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. WHETHER THE FOURTH CIRCUIT ERRED IN TOLLING THE STATE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO RESPONDENT MS. SHOOK'S CLAIM, WHEN SUCH TOLLING WAS INCONSISTENT WITH THE EXPRESS POLICY OF THE FEDERAL ACT UNDER WHICH THE CLAIM WAS BROUGHT?

II. WHETHER THE FOURTH CIRCUIT ERRED IN FINDING MS. SHOOK HAD STANDING TO BRING THIS ACTION?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 2

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS 2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 7

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 9

I. THE FOURTH CIRCUIT IMPROPERLY TOLLED THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AS TO MS. SHOOK'S CLAIM, DIRECTLY CONTRADICTING A NINTH CIRCUIT DECISION AND IGNORING THE SUPREME COURT MANDATE THAT STATE TOLLING RULES WHICH ARE INCONSISTENT WITH THE POLICY BASIS OF A FEDERAL ACT ARE NOT TO BE APPLIED TO CLAIMS BROUGHT UNDER THAT ACT. 9

II. THE FOURTH CIRCUIT ERRED IN FINDING MS. SHOOK HAD STANDING 11

III. THE DECISION BELOW WILL RESULT IN SERIOUS, RECURRING PROBLEMS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS ATTEMPTING TO SERVE CHILDREN PROTECTED BY THE EHA BY ALLOWING CLAIMS TO BE BROUGHT MANY YEARS AFTER THE ALLEGED INJURY OCCURRED 12

CONCLUSION 14

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 16

APPENDICES A-D 1A-14A
Appendix A. 1A
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
Judgment Entered August 15, 1989
Appendix B. 9A
U.S. District Court, Western District of North
Carolina Memorandum of Decision
Entered August 17, 1987
Appendix C. 13A
U.S. District Court, Western District of North
Carolina Judgment Entered August 17, 1987
Appendix D 14A
U.S. District Court, Western District of North
Carolina Order Entered June 24, 1988

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Alexopulos v. San Francisco Unified School District, 817 F. 2d 551 (9th Cir. 1987) 9, 12, 13

Board of Regents v. Tomanio, 446 U.S. 478 (1980) (quoting *Johnson v. Railway Express Agency*, 421 U.S. 454 (1975)) 9, 11

Burlington School Committee v. Department of Education, 471 U. S. 359 (1985) 8, 11

STATUTES

20 U.S.C. § 1400 et. seq. 7
20 U.S.C. § 1415(a)-(e) 2, 10
20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(1)(A), (c)-(E),(2) and (c) 10
20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(1)(B) 10
20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(1)(C) 10
20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(1)-(2) 8
20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2) 10, 11
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 2
N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-17, et seq. 6
N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-17(a) 8
N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-52, et seq. 6
N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-52(2) 8

No. 89-

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1989

GASTON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA AND THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Petitioners,

vs.

KAREN LEIGH SHOOK, by and through her guardian ad litem, WENDY SHOOK,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

Petitioners, The Gaston County Board of Education, The State of North Carolina, and The North Carolina State Board of Education, petition for a writ of certiorari to review the opinion and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit entered in the above-entitled proceeding on August 15, 1989.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion and judgment of the Court of Appeals is reported at 882 F.2d 119. It is reprinted in the appendix to this petition at Appendix A at 1A-8A.

The opinion of the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina which the Court of Appeals af-

firmed in part, vacated in part, and remanded is unreported and is reprinted in the appendix to this petition at Appendix B at 9A-12A. The judgment of the District Court allowing Petitioner's motion for summary judgment is unreported and is reprinted in the appendix to this petition at Appendix C at 13A. The order of the District Court denying a Motion to Amend or Alter the Judgment is unreported and is reprinted in the appendix to this petition at Appendix D at 14A.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on August 15, 1989. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

20 U.S.C. § 1415(a)-(e) provides:

Procedural safeguards

Establishment and maintenance

(a) Any State educational agency, any local educational agency, and any intermediate educational unit which receives assistance under this subchapter shall establish and maintain procedures in accordance with subsection (b) through subsection (e) of this section to assure that handicapped children and their parents or guardians are guaranteed procedural safeguards with respect to the provision of free appropriate public education by such agencies and units.

Required procedures: hearing

(b)(1) The procedures required by this section shall include, but shall not be limited to -

(A) an opportunity for the parents or guardian of a handicapped child to examine all relevant records with respect to the identification, evaluation, and educational placement of the child, and the provision of a free appropriate public education to such child, and to obtain an independent educational evaluation of the child;

(B) procedures to protect the rights of the child whenever the parents or guardian of the child are not known, unavailable, or the child is a ward of the State, including the assignment of an individual (who shall not be an employee of the State educational agency, local educational agency, or intermediate educational unit involved in the education or care of the child) to act as a surrogate for the parents or guardian;

(C) written prior notice to the parents or guardian of the child whenever such agency or unit -

(i) proposes to initiate or change, or

(ii) refuses to initiate or change.,

the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child or the provisions of a free appropriate public education to the child;

(D) procedures designed to assure that the notice required by clause (C) fully informs the parents or guardian, in the parents' or guardian's native language, unless it clearly is not feasible to do so, of all procedures available pursuant to this section; and

(E) an opportunity to present complaints with respect to any matter relating to the identification, evaluation, or

educational placement of the child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education to such child.

(2) Whenever a complaint has been received under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the parents or guardian shall have an opportunity for an impartial due process hearing which shall be conducted by the State educational agency or by the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit, as determined by State law or by the State educational agency. No hearing conducted pursuant to the requirements of this paragraph shall be conducted by an employee of such agency or unit involved in the education or care of the child.

Review of local decision by State educational agency

(c) If the hearing required in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of this section is conducted by a local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit, any party aggrieved by the findings and decision rendered in such a hearing may appeal to the State educational agency which shall conduct an impartial review of such hearing. The officer conducting such review shall make an independent decision upon completion of such review.

Enumeration of rights accorded parties to hearings

(d) Any party to any hearing conducted pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be accorded (1) the right to be accompanied and advised by counsel and by individuals with special knowledge or training with respect to the problems of handicapped children, (2) the right to present evidence and confront, cross-examine, and compel the attendance of witnesses, (3) the right to a written or electronic verbatim record of such hearing, and (4) the right to written findings of fact and decisions (which findings and decisions shall be made available to the public consistent with the requirements of 1417 (c) of this title and shall also be transmitted to the advisory panel established pursuant to section 1413(a)(12) of this title).

Civil action; jurisdiction

(e)(1) A decision made in a hearing conducted pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of this section shall be final, except that any party involved in such hearing may appeal such decision under the provisions of subsection (c) and paragraph (2) of this subsection. A decision made under subsection (c) of this section shall be final, except that any party may bring an action under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Any party aggrieved by the findings and decision made under subsection (b) of this section who does not have the right to an appeal under subsection (c) of this section, and any party aggrieved by the findings and decision under subsection (c) of this section, shall have the right to bring a civil action with respect to the complaint presented pursuant to this section, which action may be brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States without regard to the amount in controversy. In any action brought under this paragraph the court shall receive the records of the administrative proceedings, shall hear additional evidence at the request of a party, and, basing its decision on the preponderance of the evidence, shall grant such relief as the court determines is appropriate.

(3) During the pendency of any proceedings conducted pursuant to this section, unless the State or local educational agency and the parents or guardian otherwise agree, the child shall remain in the then current educational placement of such child, or, if applying for initial admission to a public school, shall, with the consent of the parents or guardian, be placed in the public school program until all such proceedings have been completed.

(4) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of actions brought under this subsection without regard to the amount in controversy.

North Carolina General Statute § 1-17 provides in pertinent part:

§ 1-17. Disabilities.

(a) A person entitled to commence an action who is at the time the cause of action accrued either

(1) Within the age of 18 years;

(2) Insane; or

(3) Incompetent as defined in G.S. 35A-1101(7) or (8) may bring his action within the time herein limited, after the disability is removed, except in an action for the recovery of real property, or to make an entry or defense founded on the title to real property, or to rents and services out of the same, when he must commence his action, or make his entry, within three years next after the removal of the disability, and at no time thereafter.

For those persons under a disability on January 1, 1976, as a result of being imprisoned on a criminal charge, or in execution under sentence for a criminal offense, the statute of limitations shall commence to run and no longer be tolled from January 1, 1976.

North Carolina General Statute § 1-52 provides in pertinent part:

§ 1-52. Three years.

Within three years an action -

(1) Upon a contract, obligation or liability arising out of a contract, express or implied, except those mentioned in the preceding sections or in G.S. 1-53(1).

(2) Upon a liability created by statute, either state or federal, unless some other time is mentioned in the statute creating it.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Respondent, Karen L. Shook, a multi-handicapped child, was placed in a self-contained class for the emotionally disturbed in the Gaston County Schools from October 1976 until the summer of 1979. The parents of Ms. Shook then withdrew her from the Gaston County School system and on February 20, 1980, enrolled her in the San Marcos Treatment Center of The Brown Schools in Austin, Texas.

Thereafter, the parents retained an attorney who, in the summer of 1981, requested that the Gaston County Board of Education (the "County Board") provide their daughter with a free appropriate education for the 1981-82 school year pursuant to the Education of the Handicapped Act ("EHA" or "the Act"), 20 U.S.C. § 1400, *et seq.* (1978 and supp. 1988). In response to this request, the County Board sent an evaluation team to The Brown Schools to determine the appropriateness of Ms. Shook's placement there. On December 9, 1981, the County Board's Administrative Placement Committee ("APC") met to discuss the appropriate educational placement of Ms. Shook. The parents attended this meeting.

The APC found The Brown Schools to be an inappropriate placement and so notified the parents by letter dated December 11, 1981. The APC recommended that Ms. Shook be placed at a North Carolina educational center. The letter further informed the parents of their right to appeal this decision. The parents did appeal. Due to two postponements at the request of the Shook's attorney and a third

indefinite postponement to allow settlement discussions, however, the appeal was not pursued and no decision ever made.

Counsel for both parties corresponded concerning Ms. Shook's appropriate educational placement and the APC's decision until August of 1982. The County Board and its counsel received no further communications from Ms. Shook, her parents or attorneys until 1986, when a demand for reimbursement was made by Ms. Shook's newly retained attorney. The reimbursement demand was refused. On December 8, 1986, Ms. Shook, by and through her guardian ad litem, filed this action against the County Board for reimbursement of education expenses pursuant to the EHA and ***Burlington School Committee v. Department of Education***, 471 U.S. 359 (1985). The State of North Carolina and The North Carolina State Board of Education were joined as third party defendants on June 3, 1987.

On August 17, 1987, the District Court allowed the County Board's motion for summary judgment. The Court found that the applicable three year statute of limitations for actions upon a liability created by a statute, either federal or state, was tolled as to Ms. Shook and therefore the action was timely filed. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-52(2) (1983); N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-17(a) (1987). However, the Court further held that Ms. Shook lacked standing because she had suffered no injury. Expenses for The Brown Schools were paid for with proceeds of the insurance policy of her father and while the parents might once have had an action for reimbursement, Karen Shook did not. Appendix B at p. 9A. Ms. Shook's subsequent motion to alter or amend this judgment was denied. Appendix C at p. 13A.

On August 15, 1989, the Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court finding that Ms. Shook's action was timely filed and reversed as to standing. The depletion of the insurance policy benefits was deemed a "financial interest of [Ms. Shook], and she, thus, had standing under Article 3 of the Constitution to prosecute her claim under the EHA." Appendix A at p. 1A. Accordingly, the case was remanded for trial.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I. THE FOURTH CIRCUIT IMPROPERLY TOLLED THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AS TO MS. SHOOK'S CLAIM, DIRECTLY CONTRADICTING A NINTH CIRCUIT DECISION AND IGNORING THE SUPREME COURT MANDATE THAT STATE TOLLING RULES WHICH ARE INCONSISTENT WITH THE POLICY BASIS OF A FEDERAL ACT ARE NOT TO BE APPLIED TO CLAIMS BROUGHT UNDER THAT ACT.

Where a federal court properly borrows a state statute of limitation, it also uses that state's rule for tolling the statute of limitation unless application of the state rule would be "inconsistent with the federal policy underlying the cause of action under consideration." ***Board of Regents v. Tomanio***, 446 U.S. 478, 485 (1980) (quoting ***Johnson v. Railway Express Agency,*** 421 U.S. 454 at 465 (1975)). The Court of Appeals ignored the precedent of ***Board of Regents*** and ***Johnson*** and held that the statute of limitations was tolled by Ms. Shook's infancy and incompetency. The policy behind the EHA was not even discussed by the Court in its decision.

The Fourth Circuit's decision is directly contrary to that of the Ninth Circuit in ***Alexopulos v. San Francisco Unified School District,*** 817 F. 2d 551 (9th Cir. 1987). Appendix A at 1A.

In ***Alexopulos***, a handicapped child's claim against a local school board was brought years after the alleged injury occurred by invoking the state's tolling provisions. The Ninth Circuit, following the ***Board of Regents*** and ***Johnson*** mandate, examined the policy underlying the EHA and found that Congress clearly intended that a speedy determination be made as to whether a child is receiving a free appropriate education. *Id.* at 556. The Ninth Circuit held that to permit the parents of a handicapped child to circumvent the statute of limitations by invoking its tolling provisions to bring a claim in

the child's name, years after the alleged wrongdoing, undercuts this policy. *Id.*

Congress' desire that a timely and appropriate education be provided for handicapped children is evidenced in the substantial substantive and procedural rights conferred on the parents or designated guardians of such children by the EHA. 20 U.S.C. § 1415(a)-(e). These procedural rights are conferred in order that an immediate determination can be made as to the child's rights under the Act. 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(1)(A), (c)-(E), (2) and (c). For example, when there is no identifiable parent or guardian, the local public agency must assign a surrogate parent to pursue the child's rights. 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(1)(B). Parents or designated guardians must be given written notice whenever the agency proposes to make a decision affecting the child's educational placement. 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(1)(C). Furthermore, the Act grants the parents or designated guardians a private right of action and a hearing.

By providing these considerable procedural protections, Congress has evidenced its intention that children protected by the Act not be forced to await majority or the removal of their particular disability before asserting and determining their rights under the Act. Instead, Congress desired the prompt resolution of conflicts surrounding the provision of a free appropriate education for all handicapped children, as is apparent throughout the EHA. The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals has erred by not recognizing, as the Ninth Circuit did in ***Alexopulos***, that Congress "did not intend to authorize [the] filing of claims on behalf of or by the children many years after the alleged wrongdoing occurred." ***Alexopulos***, 817 F. 2d at 556.

In ***Burlington School Committee v. Department of Education***, 471 U. S. 359 (1985), this Court determined that relief available under § 1415(e)(2) of the EHA includes reimbursement for funds expended on private tuition for a handicapped child, under certain specified circumstances. In ***Burlington***, the reimbursement remedy was explicitly given by this Court to the parents rather than

to the child. *Id.* at 372. The ***Burlington*** court, in analyzing the remedies contemplated by Congress when enacting the EHA, said "by empowering the court to grant 'appropriate' relief Congress meant to include retroactive reimbursement to **parents** as an available remedy in a proper case." *Id.* (emphasis added). The subsequent grant in Burlington was to the parents, evidencing an intent consistent with the intent of Congress, not to exclude the child but to insure that the representative of the child's rights has the power to act in an expedient fashion. In the instant case, the parents made several demands on the County Board for reimbursement which were denied. The parents subsequently abandoned the claim and after expiration of the statute of limitations on that claim, are asserting it through their daughter. Certainly, this Court could not have intended that remedy be used by the parents of a handicapped child to prolong rather than expedite the resolution of conflicts regarding provision of a free appropriate education for that child.

The Fourth Circuit's holding permits Ms. Shook to challenge, years later, a decision which her parents knowingly and deliberately left unchallenged at the time of its making. The result is contrary to the express policy underlying the EHA and in conflict with the decisions of this Court. Consequently, The County Board respectfully asks the Court to intervene to rectify the confusion regarding the proper interpretation of the policy underlying the EHA and the correct application of ***Board of Regents*** and ***Johnson*** in light of this policy.

II. THE FOURTH CIRCUIT ERRED IN FINDING MS. SHOOK HAD STANDING.

The ***Burlington*** court, in construing § 1415(e)(2) of the EHA, created the right to reimbursement in parents for expenditures on their child's education. ***Burlington***, 471 U.S. at 369. Therefore, the Fourth Circuit erred in finding Ms. Shook had standing based upon her interest in the benefits of her father's insurance policy.

The reasons this holding was in error are two-fold. Firstly, Ms. Shook is not a **parent** and Congress did not intend to confer standing to sue under the EHA to a handicapped child when that child was represented by parents or a guardian who raised the issue at the time an alleged violation of the EHA occurred. Parents may bring an action under the EHA on behalf of their children as well as on their own behalf. ***Alexopulos***, 817 F.2d at 556. To allow the child a second opportunity years later hampers the goal of Congress to ensure speedy resolution of matters regarding the educational program of a handicapped child. *Id.* at 556.

Secondly, the Fourth Circuit found that Ms. Shook suffered a financial injury upon depletion of her father's health insurance policy. The policy was for the treatment of mental and nervous disorders only and provided no coverage for educational expenses. Depletion of such a policy to pay expenses at a twenty-four hour, total care facility does not allow for even a fair inference that the proceeds were spent for educational purposes for which the County Board could be even potentially liable.

III. THE DECISION BELOW WILL RESULT IN SERIOUS, RECURRING PROBLEMS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS ATTEMPTING TO SERVE CHILDREN PROTECTED BY THE EHA BY ALLOWING CLAIMS TO BE BROUGHT MANY YEARS AFTER THE ALLEGED INJURY OCCURRED.

The decision of the Fourth Circuit not only undermines an important policy of the EHA, but denies any finality to the decisions of schools applying the Act. This has serious implications for public school systems.

In the instant case, the parents contested the initial placement decision by the local school authorities and pursued certain administrative remedies. They retained legal representation and

consequently made the informed decision not to bring a challenge in court. Despite the earlier abandonment of their claim, the parents are being allowed a second opportunity, years after receiving written notification of the APC's decision, to bring suit in the name of their child and to contest that decision.

This practice, if left unchecked, will subject local school systems to lawsuits for decisions made regarding the appropriate educational placement for a handicapped child for as many years as an applicable state tolling rule permits. A school board will have no means of protecting itself from suits brought in the child's name numerous years after the parents acceded to its decision concerning that child's educational placement.

Even if some precautionary measures were conceivable, their implementation would be so time-consuming and costly as to negatively impact upon the entire educational system. Furthermore, the process of selecting an appropriate educational placement for the handicapped child under the EHA will become so complicated and arduous as to ultimately harm the class the Act was designed to protect -- handicapped children. As Senator Williams emphasized during floor debate prior to enactment of the EHA: "Delay in resolving matters regarding the education program of a handicapped child is extremely detrimental to his development .... In view of the urgent need for prompt resolution of questions involving [... education] it is to be expected that all hearings and reviews conducted pursuant to these provisions will be commenced and disposed of as quickly as practicable." ***Alexopulos,*** 817 F.2d at 556 (quoting 121 Cong. Rec. 37, 416 (1975)).

The County Board contends that decisions and educational plans of public school systems, deliberately and knowingly left unchallenged by the child's parents at the time, should not remain viable for litigating years later.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the County Board respectfully requests that a writ of certiorari be issued to review the judgment and opinion of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Respectfully submitted, this the 9th day of November 1989

James B. Garland
219 West Main Avenue
Gastonia, North Carolina 28052
(704) 867-1113

Counsel for Petitioner
Gaston County Board of Education

LACY H. THORNBURG
Attorney General of the State
of North Carolina

EDWIN M. SPEAS, JR.
Special Deputy Attorney General

LAURA E. CRUMPLER
Assistant Attorney General

Bonnie E. Wilkison
Associate Attorney General

N.C. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
(919) 733-7387

Counsel for Petitioner The State of
North Carolina and The North
Carolina State Board of Education

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have this date served a copy of the foregoing PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT upon the attorney of record by placing same in the United States Mail, first class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

David B. Puryear, Jr.
Booth, Harrington, Johns & Campbell
P.O. Box 3585
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402
(919) 275-9567

This the 9th day of November, 1989.

James B. Garland
219 West Main Avenue
Gastonia, North Carolina 28052

Attorney for Petitioner
Gaston County Board of Education

APPENDICES A - D

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 88-3893

Karen Leigh Shook, by and through her guardian ad litem, Wendy Shook,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

vs.

Gaston County Board of Education,
Defendant-Appellee,

vs.

State of North Carolina; The North Carolina State Board of Education,
Third Party Defendants-Appellees

Judgment Entered August 15, 1989

Before WIDENER, Circuit Judge, BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge, and HENDERSON, District Judge for the District of South Carolina, sitting by designation.

WIDENER, Circuit Judge:

Karen L. Shook, by her guardian ad litem, appeals the grant of summary judgment in favor of the Gaston County Board of Education. The district court found that although the statute of limitations did not bar her claim, she lacked requisite standing. We are of opinion that the plaintiff has timely filed and further that she has standing to pursue her cause of action. We affirm in part and vacate and remand this case to the district court for further proceedings.

Karen, a mentally handicapped woman, brought this action, seeking reimbursement of education expenses pursuant to the Education of the Handicapped Act (E.H.A., 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.) In October of 1976, Karen began attending public schools operated by the defendant in Gaston County. Due to psychological difficulties, Karen's doctors recommended, in January 1980, that she be placed in a private educational institution in Austin, Texas. On February 20, 1980, Karen was enrolled at the Brown Schools which provided a program of special education and related services, including a therapeutic residential setting. She attended the Brown Schools until the conclusion of the 1981-82 school year.

The Gaston County Administrative Placement Committee, an agency of the Gaston County Board of Education, in the meantime, held a meeting which Karen's parents attended on December 9, 1981 concerning Karen's placement pursuant to the E.H.A. By letter dated two days after the meeting, the Shooks were notified that the Placement Committee recommended that Karen be placed at Western Carolina Center. The letter further informed the Shooks of their right to appeal the decision.

The Shooks retained counsel, who was informed by counsel for the Board of Education that there would be no reimbursement by the Board for Karen's attendance at the Brown Schools. While at the Brown Schools, Karen's education was paid for by her parents' private funds as well as by insurance payments, mentioned later. The insurance in question is a group health insurance policy issued by Pilot Life Insurance Company in consideration of Shook's employment for the benefit of himself and his dependents. We also note that, although Karen is an adult, she is still eligible to receive funds for special therapeutic services under the terms of the policy because she continues to be disabled by reason of mental retardation.

The policy, as issued by Pilot Life, was in what we presume to be a more or less standard form. But, at the time of Shook's

employment, the policy provisions with respect to mental and nervous disorders were changed so that Shook's policy was different from that of other employees. Shook's employer, Tultex Corporation, in the words of its Vice President for Personnel, "provided a special self-insurance plan for the direct benefit of Karen Leigh Shook, individually, to provide an available maximum lifetime benefit for special therapeutic services relating to mental and nervous disorders in the amount of $100,000." This change in coverage was made in the form of a letter from Tultex to Shook, which included the following language: "Tultex has elected to make an administrative change in your policy to provide the following coverage for your daughter, Karen: (1) increase to $100,000 the maximum lifetime benefit for treatment of mental and nervous disorders." So, as a result of the policy change, the coverage with respect to Karen's mental and nervous disorders was in favor of her by name rather than merely as a beneficiary as a result of being a dependent of Shook, and Tultex became obligated to perform the contractual obligation.

Karen reached age eighteen on February 9, 1984. A legal guardian was appointed in July of the same year, and her guardian ad litem filed this suit against the Board in 1986, seeking reimbursement for the depletion of her health insurance benefits used to pay for her education. Her parents had not previously pursued the claim in court. The district court agreed with Karen that the statute of limitations had been tolled due to her minority and incompetency, yet granted summary judgment in favor of Gaston County, finding that Karen lacked standing as it was her parents, not Karen, who had sustained the injury. Karen appeals.[1]

The district court, in its Memorandum and Order, outlined the framework of the E.H.A. The E.H.A. provides public school districts

---

1 The Board has filed no cross appeal, but argues that the judgment of the district court should be affirmed, even though there may be standing, because the statute of limitations had run. See *S.E.C. v. Chenery*, 318 U.S. 80 (1943).

with federal funding for the education of handicapped children so long as the State has in effect a policy that assures all handicapped children the right to a free appropriate public education. 20 U.S.C. § 1412(1); *Burlington School Committee v. Massachusetts Department of Education*, 471 U.S. 359, 368 (1985); *Manecke v. School Board of Pinellas County, Florida*, 762 F.2d 912, 916-17 (11th Cir. 1985), *cert. den.*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986). A "free appropriate public education" by definition includes "special education and related services." 20 U.S.C. § 1401(18); *Manecke*, 762 F.2d at 916. Federal regulations provide that if necessary to give a handicapped child special education and related services, the State must place that child in a public or private residential program at public expense. 34 C.F.R. § 300.302; *Manecke*, 762 F.2d at 917.

The three-year statute of limitations in North Carolina within which to bring a reimbursement suit based on the E.H.A. is found under N.C.G.S. § 1-52(2). However, as the district court properly found in this case, that statute was tolled by Karen's infancy and incompetency pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 1-17(a) which allows a person who is within the age of 18 at the time the cause of action accrues to bring suit within three years after the removal of the disability, in this case, upon reaching the age of majority. Thus, Karen's cause of action is not time barred as she timely filed after attaining her majority and having a guardian appointed. When a state statute is borrowed,

as here, the federal court will also borrow the state rules on tolling. *Board of Regents v. Tomanio*, 446 U.S. 478, 483-486(1980).[2]

The district court, however, granted summary judgment in favor of the defendant. It found that Karen lacked standing because it was her parents who had suffered the monetary loss. The court found that Karen had not spent any of her own money on her education, nor could she show that she failed to receive an appropriate education because of Gaston County's refusal to reimburse her parents or the insurance company.

The argument of the Board with respect to the standing of Karen to bring suit is very narrow and rather curious.

The Board acknowledges that a "child who has reached majority and is not incapacitated can represent his own interest in claims not already barred by the statute of limitations." Brief p. 10, quoting from *Alexopulos*, 817 F.2d at 556. This is in accord with the reasoning of Vander Malle, to which we have previously referred, and which we follow, that both the parents and the child have a right to bring suits on account of default under the E.H.A.

The brief continues that "it may also be possible that a handicapped child without representation of a parent or guardian may have standing to sue in his own name." Brief p.10. This boils down to the

---

2 The case of *Alexopulos v. San Francisco Unified School District*, 817 F.2d 551 (9th Cir. 1987), is to the contrary on the point that the statute of limitations is tolled in such cases. While that court recognized that state statutes of limitations, when borrowed, usually carry with them state tolling provisions, it found that the application of the tolling provision would be contrary to a federal policy that representatives of educationally handicapped children promptly assert the child's educational rights. We simply do not agree. We agree with the statement of the Second Circuit in *Vander Malle v. Amback*, 673 F.2d 49, 52 (2d Cir. 1982), that such a suit is properly maintained both by the child and its parents. That being true, the exercise of a state tolling provision in favor of the child should not deter the parents from bringing a suit at an earlier time.

contention that a child who is incapacitated by reason of a mental defect may not bring a suit such as this on his own behalf upon attaining majority, but a child who is not so incapacitated is able to prosecute his own claim. The logic of this argument simply escapes us, and we reject it without further discussion. Discriminating against a mentally incapacitated child was simply not within the contemplation of Congress, in our opinion.

This brings us to the last point in the case and the one upon which the district court rested its decision, that Karen was without standing: that she had no financial interest in the case.

While it is true that none of Karen's funds were used for her special education at the Brown Schools, the policy of insurance issued by Pilot Life and amended by Tultex was depleted in the amount of $64,198.22, and Karen's father paid $40,157.86 on the same account. Thus, the remaining insurance available for Karen was some $36,000 rather than the $100,000 policy limit provided for in the amended policy of self-insurance issued by Tultex.

It follows that if Karen had the right to demand of Tultex and Pilot Life reimbursement of any of her own funds which she might have expended on account of such special education, then she has standing in the financial sense to prosecute this suit under the E.H.A., for the E.H.A. provides that a child be furnished a "free, appropriate, public education" and the education furnished cannot be "free" if it diminishes the resources of the child, as here.

Fortunately, the law of North Carolina, which we apply in this case to determine Karen's standing in a financial sense, furnishes the answer to our problem.

Voqel v. Reed Supply Company, 177 S.E.2d 273, 277 N.C. 119 (1970), a case involving a third party beneficiary to a construction contract who was not in contractual privity with the party sought to be charged, adopted § 133 of the Restatement of Contracts. The Court said: "Restatement § 133 clearly states the law of this State and we, therefore, expressly approve the Restatement formula." 177 S.E.2d at 278. Restatement § 133 under the subject of Contractual Rights of Persons Not Party to the Contract, deals with the definition of donee, creditor, and incidental beneficiaries, which we abstract for the purpose of this opinion. If the purpose of the promisee in attaining the promise of performance is to make a gift of the performance to the beneficiary, then the beneficiary is a donee beneficiary. If the performance of the promise will satisfy an actual duty of the promisee to the beneficiary, then the beneficiary is a creditor beneficiary. If the beneficiary is neither a donee beneficiary nor a creditor beneficiary, then the beneficiary is an incidental beneficiary. So, third-party beneficiaries to contracts are classified by the Restatement into donee, creditor, and incidental.

Under Restatement of Contracts, § 136(1)(a), "[a] promise to discharge the promisee's duty creates a duty of the promisor to the creditor beneficiary to perform the promise."

Under § 133, Illustration 8 provides, "B promises A, for sufficient consideration, to furnish support for A's minor child, C, whom A is bound by law to support. C is a creditor beneficiary."

Since Shook was bound under North Carolina law to support his minor child, Karen, and since Pilot and Tultex promised Shook, for sufficient consideration, to pay the expenses for treatment of mental and nervous disorders such as those afforded at the Brown Schools and which were the obligation of Shook, it is apparent that under NorthCarolina law, as set out in the Restatement of Contracts, Karen would have had a right to sue Tultex and Pilot Life for any default in their obligations to her. We are, thus, of opinion that since Karen had

standing under North Carolina law to sue Tultex and Pilot Life on account of any default in their obligations under the policy, the diminution in the remaining amount of the policy was a financial interest of Karen's, and she, thus, had standing under Article 3 of the Constitution to prosecute her claim under the E.H.A.

The judgment of the district court is accordingly affirmed in part andvacated in part, and the case is remanded for action not inconsistent with this opinion.[3]

AFFIRMED IN PART,
VACATED IN PART, AND
REMANDED.

---

3 Because this case fits within Illustration 8 of § 133 of the Restatement, we need not decide whether or not Karen was also a donee beneficiary. We also need not decide who may be an incidental beneficiary, only that Karen was not such. Consistent with our holding is the case of *Seals v. Loftis*, 614 F.Supp. 302 (E.D. Tenn., 1985), which held that the parents of handicapped children could sue for reimbursement of insurance proceeds used to pay an obligation which was a part of the free, appropriate, public education required by 20 U.S.C. § 1412(1). The only difference between Seals and this case is the question of who may be the plaintiff, which, as we have explained above, in our opinion is a matter of indifference.

Restatement of Contracts, 2d. was adopted in 1979 and rewrote § 133 as § 302, which reclassified beneficiaries from donee, creditor, and incidental to intended and incidental, but made no meaningful change which would affect us here. Accord: *Reidy v. Maculey*, 290 S.E.2d 746, 747 (N.C. App. 1982). Significantly, Illustration 2 to § 302 is the same as Illustration 8 to § 133.

It is also worthy of note that *Williston on Contracts*, 3rd ed., Jaeger, § 356, analyzes the problem in the same manner as does the Restatement, as has been noted by the North Carolina court in Vogel at p. 278.

APPENDIX B

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Charlotte Division

No. C-C-86-555-M

Karen Leigh Shook, by and through her guardian ad litem, Wendy Shook,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Gaston County Board of Education,
Defendant,

vs.

State of North Carolina; The North Carolina State Board of Education,
Third Party Defendants.

Judgment Entered August 17, 1987

On December 8, 1986, Karen Leigh Shook, a mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed twenty-year-old woman, acting through her guardian ad litem, Janice Coulter, filed this suit against the Gaston County, North Carolina, Board of Education (Gaston County), seeking reimbursement of educational expenses pursuant to the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA, 20 U.S.C. § 1400, et. seq.)

On February 25, 1987, a motion for summary judgment was filed on behalf of Gaston County, asserting that plaintiff's claim was barred by the statute of limitation.

On July 24, 1987, the court heard oral argument on the motion of Gaston County for summary judgment. The North Carolina State Board of Education, which had been brought into the suit as a third-party defendant by Gaston County, also joined in this motion. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(c) permits the court to grant summary judgment only if the pleadings, depositions, interrogatory answers, admissions and affidavits show "that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." The burden is on the moving party to make such a showing, and the court must assess the inferences from the facts asserted in the record in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion. *United States v. Diebold, Inc.*, 369 U.S. 654, 655 (1962).

In order to understand the facts, it is first necessary to understand the statutory framework established by the EHA. The EHA provides public school districts with federal funding for the education of handicapped children so long as the state has in effect a policy that "assures all handicapped children the right to a free appropriate public education." 20 U.S.C. § 1412(1); B*urlington School Comm. v. Mass. Dept. of Ed.*, 471 U.S. 359, 368 (1985); *Manecke v. School Board of Pinellas County, Florida*, 762 F.2d 912, 916-17 (11th Cir. 1985). A "free appropriate public education" is defined as including "special education and related services." 20 U.S.C. § 1401(18); *Manecke v. School Board of Pinellas County, Florida, supra*, at 762 F.2d 916. Federal regulations provide that if necessary to give a handicapped child special education and related services, the state must place that child in a public or private residential program at public expense. 34 C.F.R. § 300.302; *Manecke v. School Board of Pinellas County, Florida, supra*, 762 F.2d at 917.

Plaintiff, through her guardian ad litem, alleges that in January, 1980, her doctors recommended that plaintiff be placed at the Brown Schools, a therapeutic residential center for special education in Austin, Texas; that both before and after placing plaintiff at

the Brown Schools, plaintiff's parents requested Gaston County to pay for this placement; that Gaston County refused to do so; and that $40,157.86 of the cost of plaintiff's special education at the Brown Schools was paid for by plaintiff's parents, and $64,198.22 was paid for by Pilot Life Insurance Company pursuant to an insurance policy of which plaintiff was a named beneficiary. Plaintiff asserts that under the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Burlington School Comm. v. Mass. Dept. of Ed., supra*, 471 U.S. at 369, she is entitled to reimbursement of these moneys paid for her special education at the Brown Schools.

It is undisputed that by August, 1982, Gaston County officials had notified plaintiff's parents that Gaston County would not pay for plaintiff's educational program at the Brown Schools. Gaston County asserts that the applicable statute of limitations for action arising in North Carolina under the EHA is the three-year period for actions upon a federal statute provided by N.C.G.S. § 1-52(2). Gaston County further asserts that plaintiff's cause of action accrued no later than August, 1982, when plaintiff's parents were notified of the final decision by Gaston County not to pay for plaintiff's education at the Brown Schools. The complaint in this action was filed on December 8, 1986, which is more than three years from the time this cause of action accrued. Accordingly, Gaston County claims that this action is barred under the statute of limitations.

In response, plaintiff agrees that her action is governed by the three-year statute of limitations in N.C.G.S. § 1-52(2), and she does not dispute that the last action by the defendants entitling her to relief occurred in August, 1982. However, plaintiff asserts that the statute of limitations was tolled due to her minority and incompetency by N.C.G.S. § 1-17(a).

Plaintiff's assertion appears to be correct. North Carolina General Statutes § 1-17(a) tolls the running of the statute of limitations for persons who are under the age of 18 years or who are insane. The plaintiff had three years in which to file this suit after her

disability was removed, or after the appointment of a legal guardian. *Johnson v. Pilot Life Insurance Co.*, 217 N.C. 139 (1940). Plaintiff's guardian ad litem was appointed on July 9, 1984, and plaintiff was twenty years old when this suit was filed. She is not barred by the statute of limitations.

The question before this court, however, is whether plaintiff has standing to seek reimbursement from Gaston County of moneys paid for her special education by her parents and by Pilot Life Insurance Company. Although it is possible that plaintiff's parents and Pilot Life Insurance Company could have alleged injury under the EHA which, if shown, would have entitled them to reimbursement of plaintiff's educational expenses from Gaston County, *Burlington School Comm. v. Mass. Dept. of Ed.*, *supra*, at 471 U.S. 369, their claims are now barred by the statute of limitations. Plaintiff herself has suffered no damages. There is no allegation that plaintiff spent any of her own money on her education, or that plaintiff failed to receive an appropriate education because of Gaston County's refusal to reimburse her parents or Pilot Life Insurance Company.

Plaintiff's theory is that if plaintiff's parents and Pilot Life Insurance Company were now to receive these funds, the funds could be used to provide plaintiff with additional educational benefits. But how plaintiff's parents and Pilot Life Insurance Company may or may not spend money in the future is not relevant to whether plaintiff has suffered an injury in the past. *Alexopulos v. San Francisco Unified School Dist.*, 817 F.2d 551, 555 (9th Cir. 1987). Under these circumstances, plaintiff lacks standing to bring this reimbursement action.

This 14th day of August, 1987.

/s/ James B. McMillan
James B. McMillan
United States District Judge

APPENDIX C

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
Western District of North Carolina

Charlotte Division
No. C-C-86-555-M

Karen Leigh Shook, by and through her guardian ad litem, Wendy Shook,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Gaston County Board of Education,
Defendant,

vs.

State of North Carolina; The North Carolina State Board of Education,
Third Party Defendants.

Judgment Entered August 17, 1987

Based on the considerations set out in the memorandum of decision filed on this day, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

1. The motion of the defendants for summary judgment is allowed.

2. The action is dismissed.

This 14th day of August, 1987.
/s/ James B. McMillan
James B. McMillan
United States District Judge

APPENDIX D

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Charlotte Division

No. C-C-86-555-M

Karen Leigh Shook, by and through her guardian ad litem, Wendy Shook,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Gaston County Board of Education,
Defendant,

vs.

State of North Carolina; The North Carolina State Board of Education,
Third Party Defendants.

Order Entered June 24, 1988

With continuing regret that I have no authority to do otherwise, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to amend or alter the judgment, Docket 29, is DENIED.

This 24th day of June, 1988.

/s/ James B. McMillan
James B. McMillan
United States District Judge